

**EMT-1 REGULATORY TASK FORCE
MEETING MINUTES
October 24, 2001
Host Airport Hotel
Sacramento, CA**

I. Introductions

A. Self-introductions were made.

MEMBERS PRESENT	EMSA STAFF PRESENT	ALTERNATES PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	ALTERNATES ABSENT
Bob Cordray	Sean Trask	Bruce Kenagy	Nancy Casazza	David Nevins
Elaine Dethlefsen			Ray Casillas	Debbie Notturmo
Donna Ferracone			Jean English	Jeff Page
Debbie Meier			Bruce Haynes	Karen Petrilla
Veronica			Pat Kramm	
Shepardson				
John Tysell			Dave Magnino	
Luann Underwood			Tom McGinnis	
Todd Wilhoyte			Debi Moffat	
			Byron Parsons	
			John Pritting	
		GUESTS	Marco Randazzo	
		Fred Claridge	Bob Repar	
			Susan Smith	
			Kevin White	

II. Minutes

Approved with the following correction:

Item V A 2 d. second sentence, typographical error, the word “and” should read “an”.

III. Agenda

Approved as written.

IV. Informational Update

A. The Task Force was updated on the following items

1. Sean Trask has accepted a position as the Health Program Manager of the Personnel Standards Unit replacing Lois Williams who accepted another assignment. Sean will continue to participate in the EMT-I Task Force. The Sean's Basic Life Support Coordinator position is open and could take some time to fill due to the current state hiring freeze.
2. At the September, 2001 EMS Commission meeting, the Commission requested that the EMS Authority put the proposed revision to the EMT-I regulations out for pre-public comment at the conclusion of the EMT-I Task Force's work since the EMT-I Task Force is recommending significant changes.
3. The Layperson AED Regulations are out for 45 public comment period as of September 14, 2001 which ends on October 29, 2001. The EMS Authority will hold a public hearing on October 29, 2001 from 9:00 AM to 12:00 noon.
4. EMT-II Regulations - The Emergency Medical Services Medical Directors Association of California (EMDAC) requested an extension on review of the draft EMT-II regulations. The EMS Authority is giving EMDAC an extension on reviewing the draft regulations before distributing the regulations for broader pre-public comments.
5. The Paramedic Task Force continues to make progress on their continuing education and continuous quality improvement revisions to the paramedic regulations. The EMT-I Task

Force is awaiting the completion of the paramedic Task Force's work to incorporate this language into the EMT-I regulations to be consistent with the paramedic regulations.

6. Assembly Bill 559 was signed by the Governor which requires use of the epi pen by all EMS personnel as well as in the schools. The EMT-I Task Force will need to include epi pens in the EMT-I regulations under scope of practice.
7. The California Fire Chiefs are merging their North and South divisions.
8. An e-mail was sent out to see if the EMT-I Task Force could meet on the first Wednesday of the month. The Paramedic Task Force meets on the first Tuesday of the month and this would make meeting easier for those folks that attend both the Paramedic Task Force and the EMT-I Task Force meetings. This also seems less likely to conflict with other meetings like Cal Chiefs, EMDAC, EMSACC, and EMS Commission since other meetings are usually held in the middle or the end of the month.

V. Old Business

A. EMT-I Certification Examination:

Discussion continued in regards to the National Registry EMT-I Exam.

1. The Task Force members reviewed the responses from the National Registry to questions that were raised by the Task Force.
2. A member of the Task Force asked about the possibility of an organization named Prometrics in developing an EMT-I certification exam. Prometrics was not identified as an organization that could develop an exam early on in the search for testing organizations that might suit the need. Another issue regarding Prometrics is that unless Prometrics has an existing EMT-I exam, the same issues surrounding the cost to develop and implement the exam would be realized as those with Cooperative Personnel Services.
3. A Task Force member asked about other states and their certification exams. A table was developed by the Vision Staff and was distributed to the Task Force Members. The table included a sampling of other states certification and recertification processes. In a previous review of states, some states use the NR EMT-I exam and others develop and validate their own exam. If California developed and validated our own exam, the costs would be prohibitive, especially since the Department of Finance has asked the EMS Authority and all other state departments to cut their general fund budget by 15 percent. Gloria Huerta was looking into grant funding to fund the development of a certification exam through CPS. The difficulty with this suggestion is that grant funding is for a specified time and then funding runs out. In order to have a proper certification exam, there are on-going costs and grant funding would have to be continuously sought after. Unfortunately, that task was not completed and Ms. Huerta is no longer on the EMT-I Task Force.
4. The Task Force raised the issue of customer service with the NR. The three EMS systems in California that use the NR's EMT-I exam have explained that NR has been very responsive to their issues and concerns when they arose.
5. The Task Force asked if the NR would have different standards for California with respect to turn around times on test results. This question was answered when the NR gave a presentation to the Task Force at the March meeting. The NR is not willing to compromise. The NR indicated in their responses to the Task Force's questions, that the NR Board of Directors gave approval to study computerized test results. When implemented this could drastically reduce the turn around time on test results. The NR indicated that this new technology could be approximately two years off. The Task Force then looked at a time line that would indicate an approximate start time for the NR. The Task Force indicated that they would like to complete their objectives by May or June of 2002. The rulemaking process could take approximately nine months, which would put that at March of 2003. The NR stated that they would need approximately 12 months to orient the state to their exam, which would put implementation around March of 2004.

6. The Task Force is interested in any items that could be included in a memorandum of understanding with the NR. Sean will check with Nancy Steiner of the Paramedic Licensure Unit to see if the EMS Authority has a MOU with NR for the paramedic test. Sean will also look into other local and state agencies that utilize the NR and report back to the Task Force.
7. For certification exam administration, the Task Force also suggested that Regional Health Centers be considered as testing sites.
8. Cost continue to be an issue for the larger employers of EMT-Is

B. Committee Report: EMT Approving Authority

1. Sean updated the Education and Personnel Committee of the Vision Project of the EMT-I Task Force's proposal of EMT training program approval.
2. One concern regarding the site visit teams from training programs within California is the potential conflict of interest for surveyors from competing training programs conducting site visits. Even if site review teams are from different regions of the state, some training programs are conducting satellite training courses in areas outside the jurisdiction from where they are approved. Another concern is that the site visit processes would have to be contained in regulation.
3. Sean will bring back the latest draft document at the next meeting.
4. The DOT instructor course may be an option to add for instructor qualifications.

VI. New Business

A. Recertification Requirements

1. The Personnel and Education Committee of the Vision Project recommended that the EMT-I Task Force look into requiring skills competency demonstrations every two years for EMT-I to recertify. The Task Force made the point that no other medical profession is required to taking a skills competency exam. The Task Force wishes to make the EMT-I regulations consistent with the paramedic regulations and are not in favor of requiring skill demonstrations in regulations.
2. The Paramedic Task Force continues to work on revising the continuing education regulations. Once this is complete, the EMT-I Task Force will consider the paramedic Task Force's revision to make the EMT-I regulations CE regulations as consistent as possible with the paramedic CE regulations.

B. Review of Task Force Objectives –

1. The Task Force Objectives were reviewed.

VII. Discussion:

A. Review of Action Items

1. Sean will look into sample memorandums of understanding with the NR
2. Sean will bring the California Council of EMS Educators Skills Exam to the next Task Force Meeting.
3. Sean will send a letter to all EMT-I Task Force members notifying them of the Task Force's desire to reach closure on the Standardized EMT-I Certification Exam topic at the next meeting.
4. The Task Force has agreed to meet on the first Wednesday of the month with the exception of January 2, 2002 since it was the day after New Years Day. The Task Force agreed to meet on January 9, 2002.

Next meeting will be December 5, 2001 from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM, in San Diego.

Recorder: Robert Cordray/Elaine Dethlefsen